

It seems likely that such a mechanism as this may account for some UFO events, especially those occurring at night when the witnesses are in their bedrooms and in a state between sleep and wakefulness, and also to people driving alone at night. But it is stretching the theory too far to try and apply it to the majority of UFO events, daylight cases and multiple witness cases especially. The author over-enthusiastically tries to persuade us that even such phenomena as visions, witches and fairies are a result of imagery, but if the phenomenon is so widespread as he would have us believe, then one must begin to doubt one's eyes: is anything you think you are seeing really there? Unfortunately the UFO phenomenon cannot be explained so easily, though Keith Basterfield has given us a valuable insight into the origins of certain types of reports.

Spanish-speaking readers will be interested to know of a new book published in Spain — *Los Ovnis*

*y la Ciencia* (UFOs and Science) by **Vicente-Juan Bal-  
lester Olmos** and **Miguel Guasp**. Dr Richard F. Haines writes in his Foreword that the authors have approached "the subject of scientific ufology systematically, carefully, critically." Perhaps some English-language publisher will be inspired to publish a translation before too long, so that we can all benefit from the authors' experience. The Spanish edition, a 382-page softcover with photographs, illustrations and tables, is available from Plaza & Janés, S.A., Export Department, Virgen de Guadalupe 21-33, Esplugas de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain, price \$9 (U.S. dollars) or equivalent.

Two books reviewed earlier in their hardcover editions and now available in paperback are: *Arthur C. Clarke's Mysterious World* (Fontana, £4.50) and *Direct Encounters* by Judith M. and Alan L. Gansberg (Coronet, £1.25).

## MAIL BAG

**Correspondence is invited from our readers, but they are asked to keep their letters short. Unless letters give the sender's full name and address (not necessarily for publication) they cannot be considered. The Editor would like to remind correspondents that it is not always possible to acknowledge every letter personally, so he takes this opportunity of thanking all who write to him.**

### Queries on the report of the 1954 BOAC sighting

Dear Editor, — The editorial leader in Volume 27, Number 3 of FSR contained some interesting notes pertaining to the classic BOAC case of June 29, 1954, off the coast of Labrador. But these notes also present somewhat of a problem because they present certain inconsistencies with previous data on this case that have come to my attention. In particular I refer to an article entitled "BOAC's Flying Jellyfish," written by John Carnell, that appeared in an issue of *Fate* magazine some months after the sighting occurred. Included in the article was an extract from the Voyage Report of Captain James Howard. This Voyage Report and your editorial leader conflict on a number of points. It is the purpose of this letter to point out these seeming contradictions, and hopefully a clarifying response from you will be in order.

One contradiction concerns the cloud cover. According to Captain Howard's Voyage Report we learn the following: "The visibility at this altitude was unlimited, with no cloud other than low overcast." Yet according to your editorial leader the BOAC aircraft was flying "...just below a

layer of broken cloud..." Also, that the large UFO "...appeared to be shape-changing while threading its way through the broken cloud..." Was there broken cloud just above the Stratocruiser or wasn't there?

The contradiction that poses a major problem concerns the question of whether or not there was *radar confirmation* of the UFO formation? Obviously, this issue is central to this incident. Again, according to Captain Howard's Voyage Report we learn the following, "I spoke to Fighter Control and he said he picked us up at 01.13 G.M.T. (when we had the object in sight), but had nothing else on his screen but us." Yet according to your editorial leader the intercepting USAF Fighter "...reported radar contact at 16 miles, with two images showing up — presumably those of the aeroplane and the large object." Also, "...and these had been intercepted on radar by Control — as implied by the pilot being ordered to 'hold.'" This is a major disparity that has arisen, and one that demands a satisfactory resolution.

Incidentally, there is *no* mention in the Voyage Report of the long "hold" delay of the Stratocruiser cited in your editorial leader. Another unresolved question!

The BOAC case is far too important

to allow these questions to remain. Your clarification of these matters would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,  
**Herbert L. Taylor**,  
3400 Fifth Street,  
Oceanside, New York 11572  
U.S.A.

January 3, 1982

[Please see Captain Howard's article elsewhere in this issue, and the editorial leader on page 1 — EDITOR]

### A travesty of a Programme

Dear Sir, — I would like to voice an opinion on Thames Television's *White Light* programme which I saw on 13 November '81. I am a police officer, and although I was on duty, I managed to arrange my refreshment period to cover the programme.

And I assume many other people expected to see a debate on at least some well-known UFO reports.

I was disgusted by the way Gordon Creighton was treated by the so-called chairman, and the "gang" of teenagers who giggled most of the time. The big mistake was to treat these morons as responsible adults.

I thought Mr Creighton very polite

and calm and proved himself a hundred per cent gentleman. This subject can only be treated seriously and not "sent-up" by some fly-by-night trendy twenty-minute stint. One might have thought that the teenage audience was put there by the late Dr Condon of the late 1960s report fame.

Yours faithfully,  
**Michael Lambert**  
Ilford, Essex  
November 16, 1981

*This letter has been held over from the last issue of FSR but, although it is now late, for which I apologise, I feel it must be published. For, after all, it was a dreadful programme. — EDITOR.*

### A reply to Mrs Druffel

Dear Mr Bowen, — I read with interest Mrs Ann Druffel's reply (FSR 27/3) to my letter published in FSR 26/5. Let me answer her succinctly point by point.

The CIA's primary function is to gather and evaluate information vital to the security of the United States. By the late 1960s, the CIA reached the conclusion that the UFO phenomenon is of a *paraphysical* nature (i.e., *not amenable to scientific study*) and constitutes no danger to the United States.

The UFO photos which Mrs Druffel says are in USAF files may show material objects in flight, looking like spacecraft of an unfamiliar design, but let's not be fooled by their *apparent or temporary materiality*. The whole shebang was set up by the Paraphysical Intelligence to make us swallow the ET hypothesis. (Here I am also answering Mr E. A. Cureton). In face of this Extra-dimensional Superintelligence, the U.S. authorities are just as powerless as we are, so there is no point in accusing them of cover-up.

Despite her belief in Marian apparitions, Mrs Druffel apparently has never studied the famous Fatima affair (the *joint* appearance of the Virgin Mary and a UFO at Fatima, Portugal, on October 13, 1917). This event, recognized as genuine by the Vatican and also known as the "miracle of the dancing Sun," *involved the appearance of a discoid flying object whose descriptions by 70,000 eyewitnesses are identical with those of today's UFO sightings: a clearly defined revolving disc; shimmering metallic look; hovering below the clouds; multicoloured rays; falling-leaf movement; rocking motion; instant drying of wet objects; strange*

(sulphurous) odour; take-off with lightning speed, etc. Since the term "Flying Saucer" or "UFO" did not exist at that time, the eyewitnesses mistook this object for the Sun. But the Sun never "dances." Moreover, it was raining at Fatima on that day. The VM was, however, visible only to three young children (Lucia, aged 10, Francisco, 9, and Jacinta, 7) who had already had five previous contacts with the VM (on May 13, June 13, July 13, August 13 and September 13, 1917).

Two well-known French ufologists, Jacques Vallée (cf. *The Invisible College*) and Paul Misraki (cf. *Des signes dans le ciel*), stressed the importance of the Fatima incident to the comprehension of the UFO phenomenon. And the Fatima apparition is by no means unique. Paul Misraki is a devout Catholic, but he unflinchingly accepts the VM-UFO connection. And your French counterpart *Lumières Dans La Nuit* recently ran a series of articles on the VM-UFO linkage (cf. LDLN 205, 206, 207, 208 and 209).

Mrs Druffel states that many close encounters with UFO entities often cause irreparable psychological/physical damage. She forgets that many such encounters have *also yielded beneficial results such as miracle healing*. Obviously, the so-called Good and Evil are skilfully mixed in these manifestations. This is just another way of the Paraphysical Intelligence to *put us off the scent*.

Mrs Druffel asserts that the Church never fears Truth about anything. Well, how about the infamous Inquisition that tortured and killed countless so-called "heretics" for more than 650 years? Galileo Galilei narrowly escaped being burnt at the stake for declaring what the Ancient Egyptians had already known 2,000 years before him: the earth rotates around the Sun. More recently, even Darwin and Einstein were vehemently attacked by churchmen.

And the *Third Secret of Fatima*, revealed to Lucia by the VM in 1917 but transmitted to the Vatican only in 1930, was to be made public in 1960. The late Pope John XXIII, however, decided to put off publication for 20 years, but in 1980, Pope John Paul II did not release it. Apparently, the Third Secret of Fatima frightened all the four Popes into silence. It presumably contains dire warnings about World War III and the demise of the Catholic Church.

I disagree with the multi-origin theory on the UFO phenomenon. The UFO and all other paranormal/religious phenomena are *transdimensional* manifestations of one and the same *neutral* Superintelligence located outside our four-dimensional physical/material universe of which we are eternal captives. All our scientific advances can only be made within the framework of our space-time continuum, and anything existing beyond it will forever remain out of our ken.

No, my letter is not pot-pourri. I take an overall approach to the UFO phenomenon (and not a fractionated one adopted by many ufologists). If the Irish were free-thinkers like me, there would be no religious turmoil in Northern Ireland. All fanaticism, religious or political, is not only absurd but dangerous.

The message which the UFO and paranormal/religious phenomena are trying to convey to us is that *we have to radically revise our ideas about so-called "God."* Mrs Druffel's views are parochial and conventional. Why should God be exclusively Christian?

Yours sincerely,

**Julian H. Kaneko**

18, rue Le Corbusier,

CH-1208 Geneva, Switzerland

December 3, 1981

### Identifying Soviet sightings

Dear Mr. Bowen, — Regarding Creighton's account of the sensational June 14, 1980 Soviet UFO:

The reports are devoid of any truly useful information (such as azimuth, elevation, angular size, and actual GMT), being replaced instead with purely subjective (and notoriously unreliable) interpretations of distance and size and sub-object location. Experienced UFO investigators should recognise the futility of any attempted analysis based on such poor data.

The most fascinating aspect of this sighting is its apparent correlation with an apparition which occurred within an hour or two over Argentina just after local sunset. An orbiting object surrounded by a vapour cloud (venting propellants following rocket burn?) could easily account for the visual stimuli, but *which* object?

As I have attempted to communicate to FSR before, a useful line of in-



quiry is connected with Soviet secret space launches. The infamous Petrozavodsk "Jellyfish UFO" of Sept 20, 1977, turned out to be the launching of Cosmos-955 from the Plesetsk Cosmodrome (see the Christmas 1981 number of *New Scientist*), a solution quite happily accepted by the USA UFO community.

The June 1980 event occurred at a time of year when objects launched eastwards from Plesetsk are in sunlight (due to the solstice "White Night" phenomenon) and also visible as far south as 40° N lat. The most promising candidate is Cosmos-1188 booster stage; I am currently obtaining the tracking data needed to verify or refute this hypothesis.

Yours in research,

**James Oberg,**  
Rt 2 Box 350,  
Dickinson, Texas 77539  
March 29, 1982

**Gordon Creighton writes:—** *The Russian UFO story was written by Henry Gris, not be me, and the responsibility for its accuracy lies with him. FSR is a form of discussion and I am a translator, in this case, of Gris's report, in order to make it available to our readers.*

*We are well aware that the story lacks scientific details such as azimuth, etc. If, and when, we ever secure such, we will publish them. However, as Dr Pierre Guérin points out, it is worth remembering that plenty of scientists will still refuse to accept any evidence, however scientific (see my Crack in the Universe interview with Guérin).*

*As for the Petrozavodsk case our sources were Russian newspapers only, such as Pravda (Truth). We published translations of what was being claimed. If it turns out to have been a terrestrial phenomenon (rocket launched on Earth) we shall gladly publish this. We have no emotional investment in Petrozavodsk or indeed in any other UFO case, nor do we need any emotional investments. Our case for the existence of UFOs is too good for that to be necessary!*

\* \* \* \* \*

*It so happened that on the day I discussed Mr Oberg's letter with Mr Creighton, an article had already been received at West Malling from Dr Pekka Teerikorpi of the Turku University Observatory in Finland. The article deals with the Petrozavodsk and June 14,*

*1980, reports from the Soviet Union. It was forwarded to me from West Malling a few days later. Readers who have not already done so, will read Dr Teerikorpi's notes ("Soviet 'UFOs' identified as satellite launchings") elsewhere in this issue, and will see that Mr Oberg's observations have been confirmed. I am thankful that this matter has now been settled for us by a scientist who is prepared to look carefully at the evidence, and to weigh up the facts for as well as against that evidence, — EDITOR]*

#### A puzzle, more or less

Dear Sir, — Jenny Randles' books have impressed me with her attention to clarity and accuracy, but her letter in Vol. 27 No. 5 refers to 150% fewer UFO sightings in 1980 than a previous year. Was this a printing error? As I see it, if we take a figure, say 1000, then 100% of 1000 is 1000: so a reduction of 100% would mean that whatever the figure was, it was reduced to nil. It is when I am asked to visualise the figure being reduced by 150% that a gentle boggle starts up in my mind. Perhaps it means that there were so many fewer sightings that there were actually *more* than before?

Yours faithfully,

**J. G. Halliday,**  
Maidstone,  
Kent

April 10, 1982

#### On psychological and physical damage: also alien intelligence

Dear Sir, — 1. The letter by Ann Druffel on pp. 27-28 of FSR 27-3, is admirable indeed. May I, however, be allowed to add a few remarks to what Mrs Druffel wrote?

It is of course true that *many* UFO encounters have led to psychological and physical damage to *some* witnesses; in several of my articles published by the now defunct Canadian journal CUFOR (later merged with JUFO, Toronto), under the title "The Interpretive Dilemma" in 3 parts (CUFOR 4-1, 4-2, 4-3), I have discussed this matter of favourable *versus* unfavourable after-effects in witnesses. (The matter is far from being as simple as one gathers from Mrs Druffel's letter). There have been certain encounters which have resulted in a dra-

matic rejuvenation of the witnesses, and in an improvement of their I.Q. (cf. Maceiras in the Argentine, &c.). Therefore, it is somewhat misleading to attribute only *unfavourable* after-effects to UFO encounters. On the other hand, it is equally misleading to say that alleged Marian apparitions have yielded only beneficial results: one has only to read the Revd. Fr. Cristiani's little book on Satan, to see that undesirable things have on occasion occurred at such times, and in such places. One should, here, bear in mind also the hysterical screams of the bemused children who alone claimed to "see" the Virgin at Garabandal, in Spain; upon returning to their normal state, they were questioned about their former terror, and they replied that the Blessed Virgin had shown them some of the horrible things that would happen to this world. A committed Roman-Catholic will need to perform some theological rationalising, if he or she is to attribute such an apparition to *Divine* intervention.

2. Regarding the most interesting article on pp. 25-27 of FSR 27-3, by Mr Ahmad Jamaludin, dealing with the various levels of intelligence displayed by UFO-nauts, might I remind readers of two things here:—

a) Mr. Aimé Michel's penetrating statement to the effect that, when we are dealing with a non-human (i.e. extraterrestrial) intelligence, we *must expect* that many of the entities' actions and reactions should seem "absurd", to us.

b) In FSR 16-6 (November-December 1970), I published an article called "UFOs and ESP," in which I discussed certain reasons why we may *think* that we are hearing our native languages spoken by UFO-nauts. I followed this up with a further article entitled "A few coincidences and two postscripts," in FSR 19-3 of May-June '73. In Ostrander's and Schroeder's fine book *Psychic discoveries behind the Iron Curtain*, we find confirmation of my thesis, *viz.* that a sufficiently deep state of hypnotic trance can at times completely by-pass the language-barrier, leading us to "understand" statements made in a strange language, while we *think* that they are couched in our language. See also my earlier articles "F.S. Occupants and S.S.P." in CUFOR 3-1; "Where Cheshire Cats outgrabe," in CUFOR 3-6; and the above-mentioned three-part article "The Inter-

pretive Dilemma," in CUFOR 4-1, 4-2, 4-3, — for further discussion of all these matters.

Yours faithfully,  
**P. M. H. Edwards, Ph.D.,**  
Victoria BC,  
Canada  
December 1, 1981

### That "sac of silence" surrounding MIB encounters

Dear Sir, — In Dr P. M. H. Edwards' article "MIB Activity reported from Victoria B.C.", (FSR Vol. 27, No. 4), the author made comment to the possible cause of the apparent lack of activity and signs of life during an MIB visitation.

May I provide an alternative suggestion?

A fly on the wall candidly witnessing an interview between a contactee and the MIB phenomenon would, I postulate, see the contactee apparently conversing with himself rather than with two or more gentlemen of whom we know so little. Around him, town or city life would continue to bustle along as always. To the contactee, all frames of human familiarity within his immediate environment would be grossly manipulated. A busy street or a city precinct would be devoid of people, traffic and any sort of movement and a state of limbo would exist within the mind of the contactee.

I feel that the MIB exist only as a subjective hallucination within the subconscious mind of the victim and created and controlled by the intelligence behind the UFO phenomena.

There have been many past cases involving MIB activity where no physical evidence has been found, where MIB, together with their means of transport, have mysteriously vanished into thin air and without a trace — much to the total amazement of the witness.

The hallucinatory techniques I have mentioned could be carried out with ease by any talented stage hypnotist, and I feel sure that it's not beyond the technology of the intelligence behind the UFO phenomena to do likewise — but remotely.

Yours sincerely,  
**C. R. H. Shelton,**  
8 Newton Close,  
Whiteparish,  
Wiltshire,  
SP5 2SP  
February 9, 1982

### Storms in a teacup

Dear Sir, — I am still attempting to fathom out the purpose of Pat Delgado's article in FSR Vol. 27, No. 5, entitled "Cheesefoot Head Mystery Rings." From the nature of the text one assumes that (Mr/Ms) Delgado was intending initially to investigate the cause of the circles, but reading it repeatedly only informs me that all that was achieved was to publicise them through the press and TV, thus creating misleading and highly speculative stories. Absolutely no regard was given by the author or the editor to the serious investigative work carried out in these very same circles by the Hampshire UFO Group, SCOPE, nor to the resulting article that appeared in *The Probe Report* Vol. 2, No. 3. (December 1981). To ascertain dimensions by measuring a small photograph shows a distinct lack of initiative, considering Mr/Ms Delgado was no more than a stone's throw from the circles themselves, and a trip down into them would not have been too demanding. Such actions would have shown that the actual diameters of the circles were 62 feet (not 52) and 26 feet (not 17), give or take an inch.

SCOPE's investigations were inconclusive, but assistance from Dr G. T. Meaden of the Tornado and Storm Research Organisation showed that a whirlwind explanation was very feasible, which became evident upon analysing weather conditions for the relevant period (again something that was ignored). The weather conditions, plus the geographical and topographical peculiarities of the location offered an explanation as to how such a formation of circles could be caused and full details of the mechanics were published in the aforementioned *Probe Report* and in Dr Meaden's *Journal of Meteorology* Vol. 7, no. 66.

What now concerns me is that the sum result of this inadequate contribution to your magazine could mean that people in the four corners of the world may now be under the impression that UFO activity caused mysterious circles in a Hampshire field, whereas in all probability UFOs are as far afield from the circles, as the circles are from the Joyce Bowles encounter which for some reason was marked on the accompanying map.

Yours faithfully,

**Ian Mrzyglod,**  
Editor "The PROBE REPORT",

*[For the information of our readers, and Mr Mrzyglod, I record that our subscriber, Mr Delgado, drew my attention to the Cheesefoot Head mystery rings in a telephone call, and mentioned that he had alerted the TV companies to them. When he offered to obtain a photograph for me, I asked him if he would be prepared to write up a short note for me — which he did. Nowhere did he claim that the rings were made by a UFO, although he did mention that a "UFO Society" chairman had done so, only to be greeted with derision. He also mentioned other explanations that had been suggested. It will be noted that Mr Delgado rightly and properly refused to take the "initiative" and vandalise the farmer's standing crop by trampling his way down to the rings, which Mr Mrzyglod suggests he should have done. I am glad he avoided that because my main interest in this puzzling but somewhat inconsequential matter lay on the fact that three sets of apparently similar mystery rings lay in a straight line across the map of Hampshire. If they are all caused by tornadoes then stranger still! — EDITOR]*

### Reputed views of former NASA scientist

Dear Mr Creighton, — Thought you might be interested in these passages from Chas Berlitz *Doomsday 1999 A.D.* published by Doubleday & Co., Garden City N.Y., copyright 1981.

On pp204-5:— "Considering the difficulty of getting individual or other planets to understand a message it is evident that mathematics and geometry, existing independently of language and alphabetical or syllabic writing, would be a logical start. Maurice Chatelain, a prominent investigator of the French messages has pursued this theory to a startling conclusion. Within the angles and inner area measurement of a double hexagon reportedly left by a UFO at Marliens, Côte d'Or, on May 10, 1967, he has been able, through the use of trigonometry and a computer, to detect that the outer surfaces give  $Pi^2$  in metres, and that the surface of the inner hexagon gives  $Sq. root of Pi$ . He has verified this independently of the metric system through measurements, comparisons, and the relationship of the angles involved."

Then on pp 206-7:— "In assessing ET communication with earth, Maurice Chatelain has the advantage of



considerable experience in communication through space. During the '60s, over a period of five years, he was Chief of NASA Communications Systems and, prior to that, Chief of Data Processing Systems at the North American Aviation Plant at Downey, California. Chatelain, like a number of other personnel at NASA, and other government agencies, no longer bound by security regulations, is definite about the presence of UFOs in space and their activities during the U.S. space shots."

According to Chatelain:— "All Apollo and Gemini flights were followed at a distance and sometimes quite closely, by space vehicles of ET origin. Every time it occurred the astronauts informed Mission Control who then ordered absolute silence."

In Chatelain's opinion, some of the space travellers may come from our own solar system, specifically from Titan, a planetary moon of Saturn having a physical condition among the planets most comparable to that of Earth. He points out that when our space probe passed over Titan its radio communication was interrupted and its photographic equipment stopped functioning almost as if it were passing through a security zone — but one not imposed by commands emanating from Earth.

You may already know Mr Chatelain, or at least be familiar with his thoughts on the subject. But if not, I thought you might like to follow up on these quotes. He sounds like a good candidate for an article in FSR. That line about "no longer being bound by security regulations" intrigued me!

Hope this matter will be of interest to you.

Yours sincerely,  
(Mrs. J. E) Dorothea Havelin,  
413 Rosemont Plaza,  
Rosemont, PA 19010

### Thoughts prompted by Dr Finch on Dinosaurs

Dear Sir, — The short article by Dr Bernard E. Finch, "Dinosaurs . . . Not Humanoids?" which was published in FSR Vol. 27, No. 4, prompts the following comments. Although I missed the original transmission of *Death of the Dinosaurs* I was sufficiently intrigued by the review of the programme, which was published in *The Daily Mail* the following day, to watch the repeat. The television critic of that newspaper had also noted the striking similarity between a model of a predicted twentieth century dinosaur and the aliens of *Close Encounters of the Third Kind*.

A remarkable coincidence, however, is one thing, and its interpretation another, so I would like to propose an alternative to the extra-terrestrial hypothesis suggested by Dr Finch. Consider the following points:—

1: The champions of the "nuts and bolts" hardware school sometimes assert that the UFO phenomenon must represent a technology that is a product of an intelligence far superior to our own (see p.18 of the same issue of FSR for example), and it is perhaps significant that if those great lizards had survived then their descendants would have enjoyed a further **sixty million years** of evolution.

2: The adaption of our alleged visitors to our environment is so remarkable that if they do indeed exist it is inconceivable that they did not evolve on a twin of this planet.

3: We know of just one planet, this one, where the dinosaurs demonstrably did exist, so why invoke a hypothetical alien alternative?

These considerations, and others, make me wonder if the UFO phenomenon ought to be interpreted as a privileged glimpse of what might have happened if history had run a different course, and if the apparent technology of the UFOs might be rep-

resentative of a *terrestrial* rather than interstellar transport system. This may offend the staunch supporters of the extraterrestrial hypothesis, but it is not too far removed from the ideas of certain theorists, John Keel in particular, and it does have the distinct advantage of eliminating the question of interstellar travel from the problem.

Further evidence which tends to support this new hypothesis can be found in Sir Victor Goddard's *Flight towards Reality* (Turnstone Books 1975). He cites two well known cases of "time warp" experiences: his own, when he apparently flew over the airfield at Drem as it would be four years later, and the two elderly English ladies who allegedly saw the garden at Versailles as it had existed a century before. However, he then tells us something which does not frequently appear in other accounts (p.129-130) **The buildings that he saw at Drem in 1935 only ever existed on paper**, the ones that were actually built followed a different plan, and the eighteenth century garden of Versailles likewise never had a physical existence, **its only reality was a plan that was never implemented**. Sir Victor Goddard invokes his own pet theory of "thought forms" in order to provide his readers with some sort of explanation, but alternative time tracks are equally worthy of consideration in speculation of this order. As Damon Knight said in his autobiography of Charles Fort (*Charles Fort, Prophet of the Unexplained*, Victor Gollancz Ltd 1971, p. 161):—

"It is perhaps easier to believe that all possible universes co-exist, side by side, in a five-dimensional space time framework."

Yours faithfully,  
M. H. Martin,  
39, Cradley Road,  
New Eltham,  
London,  
SE9 2HD  
February 7th, 1982.

**Don't forget to tell your friends about**

## **FLYING SAUCER REVIEW**

**We need all the new subscriptions we can muster at his time**

## LAUGH, LAUGH, STUDY, STUDY

*Continued from page 16*

told the geologists that he would "give them 10 million years and not a day longer" for the age of the sun. Perhaps if Kelvin had been more of a philosopher, he might have pondered whether the fossils were telling him something. Likewise, perhaps we should ponder whether the UFO phenomenon is telling us something.

### Mind and Matter

The UFO phenomenon is experienced largely through human consciousness and the human psyche. Laboratory physics attempts to work with "objective reality," but suppose there exists a class of phenomena in which subjective variables enter in the first order? How do we handle their study?

Eugene Wigner, the noted Princeton physicist, wrote that "the present laws of physics are at least incomplete without a translation into terms of mental phenomena. More likely, they are inaccurate, the inaccuracy increasing with the role that life plays in the phenomena considered . . . As we consider situations in which consciousness is more and more relevant, the necessity for modifications of the regularities obtained for inanimate objects will be more and more apparent."

It is becoming increasingly apparent to those who seriously study the UFO phenomenon that some modification in approach and methodology is necessary. Do events in the mind represent interlopers from a parallel reality? Or, indeed, are they themselves such parallel realities? Should we look to distant star systems for the solution to UFOs or much closer to a metaterrestrial rather than an extraterrestrial hypothesis?

The paranormal or "psychic" aspects of the UFO phenomenon have generally been taken as sufficient reason for dismissing the entire subject, but such dismissal smacks of scientific irresponsibility. Erwin Schroedinger wrote: "A scientist should be curious and eager to find out." I would hold that we have accumulated enough UFO data over the past three decades to be truly curious about it.

### To Explain the Inexplicable

There is indeed a growing, although still far from overwhelming, interest among scientists in the intriguing mystery of the UFO phenomenon — it just will not dry up and blow away as most of us once expected. In 1976, P. A. Sturrock surveyed the membership of the American Astronomical Society, asking whether the UFO phenomenon deserved scientific study. Among the 1,356 respondents, 23 per cent re-

plied "certainly," 30 per cent "probably," and 27 per cent "possibly" — a total of 80 per cent at least mildly in favour. Seven respondents stated that they were actively studying the problem. Surprisingly (perhaps only to those unfamiliar with the UFO scene), 62 respondents stated that they had witnessed, or had obtained recorded evidence of, an event they could not identify and that they thought might be related to the UFO phenomenon.

Another recent example of scientific interest comes from the USSR Academy of Science. Preferring the term "anomalous atmospheric phenomena," Gindilis, Men'kov, and Petrovskaya report that "the substantial percentage of observers who have adequate qualifications attracts attention: scientific workers, engineers, pilots (52 per cent). Contrary to the widespread fallacy, there is a highly significant percentage of astronomers among the observers (7.5 per cent)."

Finally, attention should be called to GEPAN (Groupement pour Etudier les Phénomènes Aérospatiaux Nonidentifiés), a government-supported scientific team within the French space agency CNES (Centre Nationale des Etudes Spatiales) that is systematically studying the UFO phenomenon. France is the only country to have officially undertaken such a project. (Characteristically, perhaps, only *French* UFOs are studied.)

When what was once believed to be a passing craze has instead proved persistent, provocative, and vexing, we may well heed the words of the astronomer Pierre Simon LaPlace two centuries ago: "We are so far from knowing all the forces of nature and the various modes of their action that it is not worthy of a philosopher to deny phenomena only because they are inexplicable in the present state of our knowledge. The harder it is to acknowledge the existence of phenomena, the more we are obligated to investigate them with increasing care."

### References

Accetta, J. S., "A Search for Possible Causal Associations between UFOs and Perturbations in Recorded Geophysical Data." *The Journal of UFO Studies* 22: 72.

American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Subcommittee on UFOs. *Aeronautics and Astronautics*, November 1970.

Gindilis, L. M.; D. A. Men'kov; and I. G. Petrovskaya, "Observations of Anomalous Atmospheric Phenomena in the USSR: Statistical Analysis." USSR Academy of Science, Institute of Space Research Report PR 473 (translation available from the Center for UFO Studies), 1979.

Hendry, A., *The UFO Handbook*, chapter 18. New York: Doubleday, 1979.

Pearson, D., "Retrospective Instrumentation for Analysis of Physical Traces of UFOs." *The Journal of UFO Studies* 2: 37.

Poher, C., "Time Correlations between Geomagnetic Disturbances and Eyewitness Accounts of UFOs." *Flying Saucer Review* 20, 1: 12.



Sturrock, P. A., "Report on a Survey of the Membership of the American Astronomical Society Concerning the UFO Problem." SUIPR Report No. 681, Stanford University, 1977.

Wigner, E., "Physics and the Explanation of Life," address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Boston, 1969.

# World round-up

*of news and comment  
about recent sightings*

## England

### Lozenge-shaped UFO watched by policemen at Milton Keynes

The national newspaper *The Sun* of March 25, 1982, told, in a report by John Kay, how, two patrolling policemen started a big security flap yesterday . . . after a close encounter with a mystery object in the sky.

"Ministry of Defence chiefs ordered a top-level probe into the lozenge-shaped UFO the cops saw humming and hovering over a town.

"They want to know if there are any 'defence aspects' to the sighting.

"The yellow-coloured object loomed into view in Saxon Street, Milton Keynes, Bucks., at exactly 4.35am.

"Patrolmen Sgt. Ian Victory and PC Anthony Underwood brought their Panda car screeching to a halt when they saw the object's flashing red and blue lights.

"The UFO gave off a low humming sound and they could clearly see its sub-structure before it vanished.

"Sgt. Victory, 45, said: 'They all laughed at us when we told them back at the police station. But I definitely saw it — and I've never seen anything like it before.'

"Milkman Richard Wait, 28, watched the UFO with the two policemen. He said: 'There was no way it could have been a plane.'

"Milton Keynes police chief Supt. John Burton said: 'These are two experienced officers and I've no reason to doubt their integrity.'

"A Ministry of Defence spokesman said: 'We are making a full investigation.'"

## West Germany

### Police report UFOs with light beams

According to a report in the newspaper *Abendpost Nachtausgabe* of March 17, 1982, Darmstadt received a UFO visitation at 9.30 p.m. on March 14. TV pictures were distorted, lights began to flicker, there was crackling

on Police loudspeakers, and scores of eyewitnesses observed strange vivid green flying objects over Messel. Among the witnesses there were also eight policemen at Arhellgen.

The main excitement was along the Messel-Darmstadt motorway, where a number of UFOs were seen behind a clump of trees. The witnesses were four policemen. The five craft were elliptical in shape, with glass cupolas on the upper part and "searchlights", and were enveloped in "flickering green light".

The electricity in Darmstadt fluctuated strongly, and on the radarscopes at the nearby U.S. Forces Base the unidentified craft were visible for half an hour before disappearing.

T.V. Professor \*Heinz Haber interviewed eyewitnesses on the local TV programme and said: "I don't believe in UFOs. The reports of things over Messel would naturally be found to have an explanation if we went into the matter." He agreed that extraterrestrial life probably existed, but considered it highly unlikely it could ever get here, owing to the problems posed by Time and Space.

Credit and thanks to reader **Werner Tiefel** of Mainz.

\*Translation from German by **Gordon Creighton**, who asks: "What on earth is a TV-Professor? Is he an expert on the subject of Television, or is he one of the professional pontificators on all subjects of whom we have so many in Britain?"

## East Germany

### "Ufonauts" — but no UFO-encountered on the outskirts of Berlin

In a special report received from reader and UFO investigator Frau Ilse von Jacobi of Munich last November, it is learnt that a mystery object flew over East Berlin a few days previously, emitting green sparks and a good deal of noise. It landed near Bernau, 30 km N.E. of Berlin, in East German territory. According to the authorities of

the Berlin Observatory it was simply a meteorite, while other versions suggested it was a Soviet rocket that had perhaps incurred damage or gone out of control. As it landed near Bernau it was rumoured to have caused an explosion, possibly through striking a factory.

Frau von Jacobi reports, however, that she had the great good fortune to interview a Berlin businessman, Hans Schlösser, a salesman for an electrical firm, who had an even stranger story to tell. He said that he and his fiancée had been in a bus which was coming from West Germany and was travelling along the West German *Autobahn* (motorway) at about the time of the alleged landing. Herr Schlösser, it seems, is not unfamiliar with the subject of UFOs, being an investigator himself, and he said that, near a bridge over the *Autobahn*, he and his fiancée, and all the other bus passengers, beheld two strange figures approaching. They were about 1 metre 60 cm in height, and clad in the glittering sort of silvery space suits and helmets that are so familiar a feature of UFO occupant reports. Each was wearing a chain which ran from the helmet down as far as his belt, and in their hands they each had an object described as resembling the *Stoppschild* (Stop! sign) carried by German railway stationmasters.

As the two personages slowly came down from the bridge on to the *Autobahn*, their appearance was so extraordinary that the bus driver slowed down to a walking pace so as to get the fullest possible view of them. The impression prevailing among the other bus passengers seems to have been that they were Russian astronauts, but Herr Schlösser would have none of this, and said they were assuredly UFO entities, since they looked just like the beings so many people claimed to have seen in close encounters. He said: "They must definitely have been the occupants of the UFO, who would on no account want to fall into the hands of the Soviets."